## Exhibit I

L3JsSECc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 SECURITIES and EXCHANGE COMMISSION, 4 Plaintiff, 20 Civ. 10832 (AT)(SN) 5 V. 6 RIPPLE LABS, INC., et al., 7 Defendants. 8 New York, N.Y. 9 March 19, 2021 10:30 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. SARAH NETBURN, 12 U.S. Magistrate Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 SECURITIES and EXCHANGE COMMISSION Attorneys for Plaintiff SEC 16 BY: JORGE G. TENREIRO 17 DUGAN BLISS DAPHNA A. WAXMAN JON A. DANIELS 18 19 20 DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Ripple Labs, Inc. 21 BY: ANDREW J. CERESNEY MARY JO WHITE 22 LISA ZORNBERG JOY GUO 23 24 25

L3JsSECc 1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED) 2 3 CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Bradley Garlinghouse 4 MATTHEW SOLOMON BY: NOWELL BAMBERGER 5 ALEXANDER JANGHORBHANI SAM LEVANDER 6 LUCAS HAKKENBERG 7 8 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP Attorneys for Defendant Christian A. Larsen 9 BY: MARTIN FLUMENBAUM MICHAEL GERTZMAN 10 MEREDITH DEARBORN KRISTINA BUNTING 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

provide a little bit of context generally for the request and why it is so inappropriate.

Ether. It has traded for years, years without incident.

Millions of XRP holders, dozens of exchanges and market makers all operated under the well-founded belief that XRP was not an investment contract and, therefore, not a security. This is not some rinky-dink ICO, initial coin offering. This was, until the SEC sued, the third largest digital asset after Bitcoin and Ether, with major customers, major bank customers, several global financial institutions.

In 2018, right after Mr. Garlinghouse became CEO, the SEC officials stated publicly, neither Bitcoin nor Ether were securities. In fact, other government agencies regulating XRP regulate it as a currency, not as a security. In fact, they brought an enforcement action in 2013, right after Mr. Garlinghouse started, on the basis that XRP was a currency.

So following a lengthy investigation, your Honor, the SEC brought this case alleging for the first time publicly in December 2020 that XRP, in their view, is an investment contract and, therefore, a security.

This is the first time -- this was the first time the SEC brought a litigated case against individuals in this space that did not sound in fraud. So when you hear discussions of <a href="Telegram">Telegram</a> and <a href="Kik">Kik</a>, please keep that in mind. These are Section

issues that are before us today, but it is just helpful for me to understand.

MR. SOLOMON: Yes.

THE COURT: My understanding of XRP is that not only does it have a sort of currency value, but it also has a utility, and that utility distinguishes it, I think, from Bitcoin and Ether.

Is that correct?

MR. SOLOMON: So Bitcoin and Ether, I think, also have utilities. They also have use. You can't use Bitcoin, for example, necessarily everywhere to buy a cup of coffee or to buy groceries, but Bitcoin does have use cases that it has developed. So does Ether. They have smart contracts, for example, that can be done over the Ethereum block chain.

XRP also has developed a number of use cases, and these started very early in the process, which is why it is so baffling that the SEC has charged this long-running scheme from 2013 to the present. Because XRP, for example, has a product called ODL, on demand liquidity, which is used to assist financial institutions in having seamless and less costly transactions in key corridors. For example, the U.S. to Mexico. And XRP as a digital asset is helpful because it means the banks don't have to have their own accounts on either end and can deploy that money more effectively elsewhere and XRP can be used as a bridge currency.

Mr. Garlinghouse was brought to Ripple to help develop these additional use cases, and they have developed them. They have major customers. So it really is strange, your Honor, that we have a situation where the SEC has charged this long-running scheme. To present day, they are alleging even today XRP is a security. It is absurd, and they are not going to be able to prove it.

What is frustrating is, because they've lumped in individuals, they basically have tried to charge this as just one long, overarching scheme. Again, it is hard to follow the complaint, but think that is their theory. There was an issuance of XRP very early, and then the company,

Mr. Garlinghouse and Mr. Larsen, even though they came at different times and had different roles, in selling their XRP, both for Ripple, and also selling their XRP themselves, were scheming to violate the SEC's registration requirements.

Again, all of this happened openly, notoriously, right under their nose for years.

Market makers thought it was not a security.

Exchanges thought it was not a security. Millions of retail holders thought it was not a security. And the SEC did nothing until December 2020. So that is — sorry to be frustrated about it, but it really is one of these situations where you hate to be trite. It is pure regulatory overreach, especially dragging individuals into this.

So forget everybody else who is selling XRP, these individual defendants violated Section 5 each and every time that they sold it?

MR. TENREIRO: Well, your Honor, so -- I'm sorry. What was the question about other individuals that were selling?

THE COURT: Presumably under this theory then, every individual in the world who is selling XRP would be committing a Section 5 violation based on what you just said.

MR. TENREIRO: That's not quite correct, your Honor. So the statute, the Securities Act of 1933 has sort of a registration provision under Section 5, and then an exemption provision under Section 4. And broadly speaking, the Section 4 exemptions, I'm speaking very generally here, if these are transactions by people in the market, they are exempted by statute.

Section 5, though, focuses on and is relevant to this case, the issuer and the affiliates of the issuer. So it is only Mr. Larsen and Mr. Garlinghouse, the CEOs, or someone on the board. The affiliates of the issue are captured by the statute. Section 4 specifically exempts these transactions that the court put in the hypothetical of all these other people buying and selling XRP in the market. I don't think that would be the case, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you have specific claims -- I

apologize for asking a question maybe I should know the answer to -- but you have claims against these two defendants that they have engaged in these violations.

I thought the claims were aiding and abetting of Ripple. But there is also claims that they individually engaged in violations?

MR. TENREIRO: Yes. We allege that they -- we allege that the individuals violated Section 5 with their own sales because they were affiliates of Ripple when they were making the sale. So their sales, every time they sold and failed to register the transaction, unless they point to an exemption, they violated Section 5 individually, irrespective of Ripple's violation.

So that is correct, we have Section 5 claims against them, and we have aiding and abetting claims also against them for Ripple's violation.

THE COURT: That clarification is helpful.

MR. TENREIRO: Thank you, your Honor.

Now, if I might move on to the other reasons why the financial information is relevant, and that does get to the Section 5 claim.

Mr. Solomon, at some point during his presentation, said that, you know, all sorts of individuals, including his clients, were operating under -- I think it was a good faith belief, or perhaps I'm paraphrasing, something along the lines